

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 10, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-10, 15-29, 33-43, 47, 48, and 51-59 were pending and rejected claims 1-10, 15-29, 33-43, 47, 48, and 51-59. Claims 1, 21, 35, 51, 53, 55 and 57 have been amended, claim 60 is new, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-10, 15-29, 33-43, 47, 48, and 51-60 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 35-47, 48, 55, and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as being non-enabling.

In item 21 on page 4 of the current Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 35-48, 55 and 56 are "based on a disclosure, which is not enabling" with regard to the term "a mechanically or by chemical action".

However, support for "mechanically" storing information as data and programs is found in the specification, for example, at page 29 with regard to CD-ROM, CD-R/W, 8mm tape etc. It is a well-known principle that such types of storage include some mechanical attributes associated with their storage mechanism.

Further, support for "chemical action" is found in the specification, for example, at page 28, line 23 – page 29, line 6, which describes magneto-optic disks and read-only-memory (ROM). Readable-by-computer recording mediums that make use of "chemical action" is well known by those skilled in the art. For example, it is a well known principle that in order to increase the information storage density on, for example, **magneto-optical storage media**, the **recording/read heads** of such magneto-optical storage media use are fabricated by chemical processes such as sputtering, evaporation, molecular beam epitaxy (MBE) or metallo-organic **chemical vapor deposition (MOCVD)**. Similarly, for example, read-only-memory (ROM) is often distributed in the form of an integrated circuit, which is manufactured using a photo-resist based chemical process. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the term "chemical action" is well known in the art and examples are given in the specification.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 35-47, 48, 55, and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

In item 23 on page 5 of the current Office Action, the Examiner notes "it is not clear what is meant by 'A storage medium readable by a machine ...'". However, it is respectfully submitted that this statement describes "a storage medium" such that the storage medium is "readable by a machine," such as a computer.

Further, on page 28, lines 16-25 of the specification, the specification describes how "readable-by-computer recording medium embraces recording mediums capable of storing information such as data, programs ... which can be all read by the computer". The specification also describes that the recording mediums are capable of storing information such as data, programs "electrically, magnetically, optically, mechanically or by chemical action". The Examiner states that it is not clear what is meant by "'mechanically or by chemical action' which can be all read by the computer."

As explained in section II above, mechanical and chemical storage means are well-known by those skilled in the art.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are definite, and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter with Applicant regards as the invention. Further, it is respectfully submitted that the specification clearly describes the invention.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10, 15-29, 33-43, 47, 48 AND 51-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Legall WIPO/PCT Application No. WO 98/43183) in view of Snyder U.S. Patent No. 6,643,641.

Each of the independent claims is amended herein to further clarify the features of the claims. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, on page 8, lines 24 – 26 and page 16, line 7 – 10 and figure 8. Claim 1 specifically recites, amongst other novel features, "determining a sequence of reproducing a content data searched **based on predetermined parameters set by a user and a reproduction time of the content data.**" (Emphasis added). Legall and Snyder, either singularly or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest these features.

Instead Legall merely discloses a search utility that enables a user to search for and to access information from a variety of information resources wherein steps are performed **to render on a display, the query of the results of the search performed.** See, for example,

FIG. 6 and Abstract of Legall. In Legall, the search tool performs a search of the electronic program guide (306) and information resource and modifies the display of the electronic program guide (316) to identify those programs that are filtered from the search. Further, Legall discloses how the information related to the World Wide Web and the URLs of the web sites that include information relative to filter elements are displayed. The user then views the EPG (320) and selects broadcasts of programs to display as well as proceed to the web sites indicated by selection of the corresponding elements on the display. See, for example, Abstract and page 11, lines 3-17 of Legall.

On page 8 of the Office Action the Examiner states "Legall specifically teaches multiple web pages or sites are reproduced both forward and back across the multiple sites in the display window as detailed on page 11, lines 9-16." However, it is respectfully submitted that Legall fails to disclose, teach or suggest "determining a sequence of reproducing a content data searched **based on predetermined parameters set by a user and a reproduction time of the content data**", as specifically recited by Applicant in, for example, amended claim 1. Instead, Legall merely discloses "a first web site can be automatically brought to the user's display or multiple web sites can be displayed, and the user can go forward or back across the multiple sites inside the HTML window." See, for example, page 11, lines 13 – 16 of Legall. Legall simply discloses the search results can be displayed and browsed. Legall does not disclose determining a sequence in which to reproduce the content data searched. Furthermore, Legall does not teach basing the sequence on predetermined parameters set by a user and a reproduction time of the content data. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted, the feature of "determining a sequence of reproducing a content data searched **based on predetermined parameters set by a user and a reproduction time of the content data**" is absent in Legall as recited in, for example, amended claim 1.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that nothing was cited or has been found in Snyder suggesting modification of Legall to overcome the deficiencies discussed above. Instead, Snyder discusses an improvement to an Internet search engine by storing small "snapshot" images of web pages wherein when a user uses the search engine, and these snapshots get displayed on the search result screen next to their corresponding URLs. See, for example, the Abstract of Snyder. However, Snyder is silent with respect to the features of "determining a sequence of reproducing a content data searched **based on predetermined parameters set by a user and a reproduction time of the content data**," which are specifically recited by Applicant in, for example, claim 1.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences in the various other claims over the cited references.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 60 is new. Support for claim 60 can be found in claims 1 and 21. Legall and Snyder, taken separately or in combination failing to teach or suggest "the sequence based on predetermined parameters set by a user and a reproduction time of the content data."

SUMMARY

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 11, 2006

By: /James J. Livingston/
James J. Livingston
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501